



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/425,177	10/22/1999	MICHAEL CARROLL	52817.000102	9182

29315 7590 03/07/2005

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/425,177

Applicant(s)

CARROLL, MICHAEL

Examiner

Almari Yuan

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE and Amendment filed on 11/29/04.
2. Claim 23 is newly added. Claims 1-23 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 23 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/29/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims 1, 9, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 23 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Regarding independent claims 1, 9, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 23, the added amended language “wherein

Art Unit: 2176

the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions remain selected” and “simultaneously process...” is not specifically described/enabled in Applicant’s specification.

The Applicant is reminded against the addition of new matter.

Regarding claims 2-8, 10-15, and 18-20 are rejected fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 13, 15-18, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sybex, Inc. “The ABCs of Word 97”, 1997, Second Edition, pages 10-12 and pages 43-44 (herein after “Sybex”) in view of Microsoft Word 97 application “screenshots”, 1997, Microsoft Corporation, pages 1-5 (herein after “Word 97”).**

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 21-23, Sybex discloses:

A method of processing at least two associated target information regions within an electronic document generated by a word-processing application, the method comprising the steps of:

accepting input to select a continuous target information region within the electronic document; accepting input to process the associated target information regions (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches for the user to apply bold, italic, or underline, the user needs to select the text, then

click on Bold, Italic, or Underline button on the Formatting toolbar. When the user applies one of these attributes, the relevant button will appear pushed in; furthermore, the user can remove bold, italic, or underline by selecting the emphasized text, then click the relevant button again to remove formatting).

However, Sybex does not explicitly disclose, “deselect at least one portion of the continuous target information region to form the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions ” and “wherein the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions remain selected and simultaneously processing regions”.

Word 97 does disclose “deselect at least one portion of the continuous target information region to form the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions”, on page 2 shows the user can select a region; on page 3 shows the user can click on the “Bold” button from the formatting toolbar to apply “Bold” on the selected region; on page 4 shows the user can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold (deselect portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions.

Word 97 does disclose “wherein the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions remain selected”, on page 5 shows the two associated noncontiguous bolded regions is remained bolded (selected) after removing the bold of the word “the. After the removal of the bold on the word “the”, the two associated noncontiguous can remain bolded at the same time.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold (deselect) within a bolded region and wherein the two associated noncontiguous bolded regions

Art Unit: 2176

remains bolded (selected), as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 10, and 18, Sybex discloses:

wherein the contiguous target information regions comprises text (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches the formatting process is done on text within a word-processing document).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Word 97 discloses:

accepting input for creating additional associated noncontiguous target information regions (Word 97 on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold (deselect) within a bolded region, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Word 97 discloses:

accepting further input to change content of the at least two associated target information regions (Word 97 on page 2 shows the user can select a region and on page 3 shows the user can click on the "Bold" button from the formatting toolbar to apply "Bold" on the selected region, in other words, the word-processing application can let the user change content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold (deselect) within a bolded region, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process

Art Unit: 2176

of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 15, Sybex discloses:

wherein the electronic document comprises graphical information (Sybex on pages 10-12 teaches the user can insert graphics or pictures into the word-processing document).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Sybex discloses:

wherein the input interface accepts input from at least one of a keyboard, a speech to text converter, a mouse, a pressure pad and a trackball device (Sybex on pages 10-12 and pages 43-44 the input function can be performed using the keyboard or mouse).

Regarding independent claim 17, Sybex discloses:

A system for processing noncontiguous target information within an electronic document, the system comprising:

input means to accept input for selecting a contiguous target information region and processor means for processing the target information regions, said processor means operatively connected to the input means (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches for the user to apply bold, italic, or underline, the user needs to select the text, then click on Bold, Italic, or Underline button on the Formatting toolbar. When the user applies one of these attributes, the relevant button will appear pushed in; furthermore, the user can remove bold, italic, or underline by selecting the emphasized text, then click the relevant button again to remove formatting).

However, Sybex does not explicitly disclose “selecting at least one information separating region that divides the continuous target information region into at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions”.

Word 97 on page 3 shows the user can click on the “Bold” button from the formatting toolbar to apply “Bold” on the selected region; on page 4 shows the user can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold; and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions, in other words, the user selects a region to “unbold” within a bolded region forming two bolded regions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold within a bolded region to form two bolded regions, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

8. **Claims 3-4, 8, 11-12, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Sybex” in view of “Word 97”, as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 13, 15-18, and 21-22 above, in further view Greyson et al. (USPN 5,666,552 – issued on 09/1997). Regarding dependent claim 3, Sybex and Word 97 disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described above. However, Sybex and Word 97 do not explicitly disclose “first begin select delimiter located left of the target information and a first end select delimiter located right of the continuous target information region”.**

Greyson et al. (Greyson) on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches initial and final selection point of the selection region.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point

Art Unit: 2176

the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Greyson discloses:

accepting input to deselect at least one portion of the target information region comprises storing locations of a second end select delimiter that is located between the first begin select delimiter and first end select delimiter and a second begin select delimiter that is between the second and first end select delimiters (Greyson on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches extending from the initial selection point to the final selection point of the selection region; wherein using the cursor will define the bounds of the selection region).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Greyson discloses:

each rectangle having two delimiter tags located at opposite corners (Greyson on col. 5, line 56 – col. 6, line 28: teaches highlighting (visually show as a rectangle) the selected text region visually indicates the selection).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 19, Greyson discloses:

wherein the processor unit stores a begin tag and an end tag for each of the target information regions (Greyson on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches initial (begin tag) and final (end tag) selection point of the selection region).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 20, Word 97 discloses:

further comprising an output interface to transmit a display that shows at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions in a different manner than the at least one deselected portion of the continuous target information region (Word 97 page 4 shows the user can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold (deselect portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex and Greyson to provide a way to remove bold within a bolded region forming two noncontiguous bolded portions, as taught by Word 97, incorporated into the selection of a text, as taught by Sybex and Greyson, in order to directly and visually manipulate text or symbols on a computer display screen.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Word 97 discloses:

wherein the input interface receives input for a positional indicator and the processor unit selects information when the positional indicator is moved in a first direction and deselects information when the positional indicator is moved in a second direction (Word 97 page 4 shows the user can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold (deselect portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions and shows a positional indicator; wherein the indicator can move in any direction by using the mouse).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex and Greyson to provide a way to remove bold within a bolded region forming two noncontiguous bolded portions, as taught by Word 97, incorporated into the selection of a text, as taught by Sybex and Greyson, in order to directly and visually manipulate text or symbols on a computer display screen.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 8:

Applicant argues the references do not teach two non-contiguous target information regions that remain selected and simultaneously processing the target information regions that remain selected.

Word 97 does disclose "wherein the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions remain selected", on page 5 shows the two associated noncontiguous bolded regions is remained bolded (selected) after removing the bold of the word "the. After the removal of the bold on the word "the", the two associated noncontiguous can remain bolded at the same time.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY
March 2, 2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER